

Version with Markings to Show Changes Made

1. (Twice Amended) A Caller ID device, comprising:
a memory adapted to store Caller ID data associated with an incoming call; and
a processor adapted to selectively store the Caller ID data in said memory based on an off-hook status of a telephone.

11. (Twice Amended) A telephone, including a Caller ID device, the Caller ID device comprising:
a memory adapted to store incoming Caller ID data associated with an incoming call; and
a processor adapted to selectively store the Caller ID data in said memory based on an off-hook status of said telephone.

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 remain pending in the application.

The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider earlier rejections in light of the following remarks. No new issues are raised nor is further search required as a result of the changes made herein. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-24, 26 and 28 over Reuben

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-24, 26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Reuben et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,467,385 (“Reuben”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-5 and 11-15 recite, *inter alia*, a processor adapted to selectively store Caller ID data based on an off-hook status of a telephone. Claims 21-24, 26 and 28 recite, *inter alia*, making a selective Caller ID storage decision based on an off-hook status of a telephone.

The Examiner alleges that Reuben discloses an SRAM that functions as a buffer to temporarily store CID information before a determination of an off-hook status of a telephone and an answering machine is made. The Examiner alleges that CID information is not always stored (Office Action, page 6).

Reuben discloses CID data is temporarily stored in an SRAM before being sent to a visual display (col. 9, lines 4-7). The CID data is also sent to a voice synthesizer for conversion into an immediate announcement on a speaker, if desired, and for recording on an answering machine (Reuben, col. 9, lines 8-10). When the line is quiet, i.e., when an outgoing message has finished playing, CID information containing time and date is optionally sent to a voice synthesizer and recorded by the answering machine (Reuben, col. 11, line 65-col. 12, line 14).

At every point Reuben details moving CID information from temporary storage to the answering machine, there are no conditions placed on its storage in the answering machine, i.e., it is ALWAYS stored by both the

temporary storage and the answering machine (Reuben, col. 9, lines 4-10; col. 12, lines 8-14). Temporary storage does not indicate that the storage is selective (as suggested by the Examiner, page 6), much less based on an off-hook status.

At best, Reuben discloses selective playing of CID information when a line is quiet, i.e., based on when an outgoing message has finished playing (as stressed by the Examiner, page 6). Contrary to the Examiners allegation, Reuben fails to disclose anywhere that storage of CID data is selective based on an off-hook status, as recited 1-5, 11-15, 21-24, 26 and 28.

The Examiner alleges that claims 1 and 11 do “not call for a processor adapted to selectively store the caller ID data [in said memory] based on an off-hook status of the telephone” (Office Action, page 6). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 1 and 11 specifically recite a processor adapted to selectively store a Caller ID data in a memory based on an off-hook status of a telephone.

The Examiner alleges claims 1 and 11 do not exclude the step of temporarily storing CID in a memory buffer and later transferring the CID to a storage device. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Reuben’s temporary storage of CID information in a memory buffer for later transfer to a storage device, i.e., an answering machine does not read on applicants’ claimed invention. Temporary storage of CID information for storage on an answering machine is NOT selective storage, much less selective storage of Caller ID data based on an off-hook status of a telephone, as recited by claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-24, 26 and 28. Excluding “temporarily storing CID in a memory buffer and later transferring the CID to a storage device” misses the point that Applicant’s invention selectively stores, i.e., it may or may not store, CID information based on an off-hook status.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-5, 11-15, 21-24, 26 and 28 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 16 and 27 over Reuben in view of Hirai

In the Office Action, claims 6, 16 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Reuben in view of Hirai, U.S. Patent No. 5,446,785 (“Hirai”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6, 16 and 27 are dependent on claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 11 and 21.

Claims 6 and 16 recite, *inter alia*, a processor adapted to selectively store Caller ID data based on an off-hook status of a telephone. Claim 27 recites, *inter alia*, making a selective Caller ID storage decision based on an off-hook status of a telephone.

As discussed above, Reuben fails to teach selective storage of Caller ID data based on an off-hook status, as claimed by claims 6, 16 and 27.

The Office Action relies on Hirai to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Reuben to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Hirai appears to disclose a telephone terminal equipment that detects caller ID information, stores the caller ID information and displays the caller ID information on a liquid crystal display (col. 11, lines 54-64). The caller ID information is stored for each incoming call (Hirai, col. 13, lines 32-38).

Hirai discloses caller ID information is stored for each incoming call. Hirai fails to teach selective storage of caller ID data based on an off-hook status, as claimed by claims 6, 16 and 27.

Neither Reuben nor Hirai, either alone or in combination, disclose teach or suggest selective storage of caller ID data based on an off-hook status, as claimed by claims 6, 16 and 27.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 6, 16 and 27 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34 over Reuben in view of Lim

In the Office Action, claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Reuben in view of Lim et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,883,942 (“Lim”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34 are dependent on claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 11 and 21.

Claims 7-10 and 17-20 recite, *inter alia*, a processor adapted to selectively store Caller ID data based on an off-hook status of a telephone. Claims 25 and 29-34 recite, *inter alia*, making a selective Caller ID storage decision based on an off-hook status of a telephone.

As discussed above, Reuben fails to teach selective storage of caller ID data based on an off-hook status, as claimed by claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34.

The Office Action relies on Lim to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Reuben to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Lim appears to disclose a caller-ID device and/or an integrated caller ID and answering machine device which is configurable (Abstract). When the caller ID device receives an incoming call, it shows caller ID information for an incoming call on a display unit (Lim, col. 6, lines 14-17). At the same time, the caller ID device stores the caller ID information of the incoming call in a caller ID memory area of a data storage unit for later access and review by a user (Lim, col. 6, lines 20-23).

Lim discloses caller ID information is stored for each incoming call. Lim fails to teach selective storage of caller ID data based on an off-hook status, as claimed by claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34.

Neither Reuben nor Lim, either alone or in combination, disclose teach or suggest selective storage of caller ID data based on an off-hook status, as claimed by claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 7-10, 17-20, 25 and 29-34 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No. 36,457

Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC
2000 M Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df